



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/747,867	12/23/2003	B.J. Herbison	SUN03-12(040036)	2764
58408	7590	09/10/2007	EXAMINER	
BARRY W. CHAPIN, ESQ. CHAPIN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW, LLC WESTBOROUGH OFFICE PARK 1700 WEST PARK DRIVE WESTBOROUGH, MA 01581			TRAN, QUOC A	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2176				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/10/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/747,867	HERBISON ET AL.
	Examiner Tran A. Quoc	Art Unit 2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 July 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1,2,4-16,18 and 22-37 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-2, 4-16, 18, and 22-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 24 July 2007 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This is a **Non-Final** Rejection in response to the RCE filed on 07/24/2007.

Claims 1-2, 4-16, 18, and 22-37 are pending and rejected in this action. Applicant has cancelled claims 3, 17, and 19-21, claims 1, 15, 29, and 30-31 are independent claims, Effective filing date 11/30/2000 (Sun Micro).

Amendments to the Specifications (See Page 10, Lines 16-22) is accepted,

Based on Applicant's amendments, the objections to the Specification, the Drawings, and Claims 4-6, 8, 10, 12-15, 17-18, 24, 26-36 previously set forth are withdrawn.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 07/24/2007 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 4-11, 14-16, 18, 22-25, 28 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Hefetz et al. US 20040123238A1 filed 07/28/2003 [hereinafter “Hefetz”], in view of Ehring et al. US 20050097008A1 Continuation of 09/466,541 - filed 12/17/1999 [hereinafter “Ehring”].

Regarding independent claim 1,

a method for producing an output report,

(See Hefetz Figure 6 → discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited figure)

comprising: identifying a page template indicative of an output report having passive content, the passive content being static

(See Hefetz Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the page layout deployment system, when the portal receives a request from a user, obtains a template that includes static content)

parsing tokens from the page template, the tokens indicative of dynamic content, the dynamic content adapted to provide at least a portion of the output report.

(See Hefetz Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system parses the template for placeholders, locates the placeholders and replaces them with dynamic content to generate a web page in response to the user's request);

for each token, generating the dynamic content, generating further comprising fetching output data and processing display data, the output data operable to be retrieved from a dynamic repository and display data operable to indicate organization of the fetched output data.

(See Hefetz Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system replaces the located placeholders with dynamic content using ILayoutStructure objects and iViews);

building the output report by assembling the generated dynamic content for each token in the page template, the page template indicative of a plurality of output reports,

(See Hefetz Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited text,

Also, see Hefetz Page 5, Para 45, discloses specify the layouts of multiple pages (i.e. the claimed reports is pages as taught by Hefetz).

The dynamic content further comprising java server pages referencing metalanguage representations of at least portions of other java server pages corresponding to the same rendered output report.

(See Hefetz Figure 5; see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0035; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Pages 5-6, Paragraphs 0048-0055; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system comprises JSPs that include XML containers, wherein the system translates the placeholders into presentations of the containers comprising the obtained dynamic content).

In addition, Hefetz teaches:

building further comprising rendering an output page, by fetching,

(See Hefetz Fig. 4-5 and Page 5, Paragraph 44 → the dynamic content container 450 can include a single iView 452. Hefetz discloses

in order for the iViews appears in the page, the fetched dynamic content is call in an array of iViews' content, where the page builder 600 can call an ILayoutStructure object 620, which translates this profile into the requested semantic data (see Hefetz Fig. 4-5 and Page 5, Paragraph 44).

Hefetz does not expressly teach, but Hayton teaches:

building further comprising rendering an output page, by fetching, based on the parsed token, a page descriptor corresponding to parsed token, retrieving the dynamic content from the fetched page descriptor, the page descriptor defining the metalanguage representation;

(See Ehring Page 14 Para 174, discloses application rule(s) and variables from dynamic content composition engine 200 to select from among XML descriptions and convert such XML objects into client-side code (e.g., JavaScript) for inclusion within web page 305 (step 1410), delivered by web server 300 to web browser 310 and displayed to the user.

Also, see Ehring Page 16 Para 213, discloses intelligently pre -fetching and delivering to the user's web browser the most likely next pages (and/or component content objects) while the current web page is being viewed.

Also, see Ehring Fig. 3, Page 4 Para 61, discloses the content objects, which in one embodiment are created in XML, include web pages (and their corresponding templates), stacks, content elements, and primitive objects infrastructure used by application authors to create a structural hierarchy of content objects (described below with reference to FIG. 3).

Using the broadest reasonable interpretation, the Examiner reads the claimed *parsed token, and, the page descriptor defining the metalanguage representation* as equivalent to a structural hierarchy of content objects, and XML descriptions page as taught by Ehring, and because Applicant's Specification, discloses " The page

descriptors are defined in XML or other metalanguage.." See Applicant's Spec Page 9 Lines 5-10.)

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Hefetz, to include:

- *building further comprising rendering an output page, by fetching, based on the parsed token, a page descriptor corresponding to parsed token, retrieving the dynamic content from the fetched page descriptor, the page descriptor defining the metalanguage representation,*

for the purpose of designs content components and application rules that are interpreted by the system dynamically, at runtime, to generate and deliver to users personalized HTML web pages, including client-side objects that track user behavior and enhance users' interaction with the application. Such rules dynamically adapt the author's goals to the appropriate users at the appropriate time, thereby simulating the dialogue between users and human salespersons/customer service personnel in the context of an automated interactive system (see Ehring at Page 1 Para 12).

Claim 2:

Hefetz discloses *the method of Claim 1, further comprising:*

- ***receiving a user request for an HTML page, wherein said building further comprises rendering the HTML page responsive to the user request*** (see Page 1, Paragraph 0007; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Page 5, Paragraph 0048; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph

0042; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system generates a web page in response to the user's request).

Claim 4:

Hefetz discloses *the method of Claim 1, wherein said building the output report further comprises:*

- ***receiving an HTTP request on behalf of a user, the HTTP request indicative of an HTML response*** (see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system, when the portal receives a request from a user, generates the web page in response to the user's request);
- ***determining the page template corresponding to the requested HTML response*** (see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system obtains the template based on the request that is received from the user);
- ***generating, in a rendering engine, a JSP output page from the determined page template*** (see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Page 5, Paragraph 0048; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system generates the web page using JSP); and
- ***transmitting the generated JSP output page to the user as an HTML page*** (see Page 1, Paragraph 0007; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see

Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Page 5, Paragraph 0048; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system transmits the web page in response to the user's request).

Claim 5:

Hefetz discloses *the method of Claim 1, wherein the display data is formatted according to a predetermined syntax, the predetermined syntax operable for parsing and verifying of the display data* (see Figures 5 and 6; see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Pages 5-6, Paragraphs 0048-0055; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system comprises JSPs that include XML containers, wherein the system translates the placeholders into presentations of the containers comprising the obtained dynamic content).

Claim 6:

Hefetz discloses *the method of Claim 5, wherein the predetermined syntax, the predetermined syntax is a different syntax than the page template and generating further comprises interpreting the display data from the predetermined syntax into the syntax defining the page template* (see Figures 5 and 6; see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages

3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Pages 5-6, Paragraphs 0048-0055; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system comprises JSPs that include XML containers, wherein the system translates the placeholders into presentations of the containers comprising the obtained dynamic content).

Claim 7:

Hefetz discloses *the method of Claim 5, wherein the predetermined syntax includes syntactical elements, and is further operable for nesting the syntactical elements, the nested syntactical elements defining a hierarchical structure* (see Figures 5 and 6; see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Pages 5-6, Paragraphs 0048-0055; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system comprises JSPs that include XML containers, wherein the system translates the placeholders into presentations of the containers comprising the obtained dynamic content).

Claim 8:

Hefetz discloses *the method of Claim 7, wherein the dynamic content is active content and the predetermined syntax conforms to XML, in which the syntactical elements further comprise XML tags* (see Figures 5 and 6; see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033;

see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Pages 5-6, Paragraphs 0048-0055; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system comprises JSPs that include XML containers, wherein the system translates the placeholders into presentations of the containers comprising the obtained dynamic content).

Claim 9:

Hefetz discloses *the method of Claim 8, wherein the predetermined syntax is a page descriptor syntax defined by an XML schema* (see Figures 5 and 6; see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Pages 5-6, Paragraphs 0048-0055; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system comprises JSPs that include XML containers, wherein the system translates the placeholders into presentations of the containers comprising the obtained dynamic content).

Claim 10:

Hefetz discloses *the method of Claim 1, wherein the tokens are metadata tokens* (see Figures 5 and 6; see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Pages 5-6, Paragraphs 0048-0055; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system comprises JSPs that include XML containers,

wherein the system translates the placeholders into presentations of the containers comprising the obtained dynamic content), *further comprising*:

- ***parsing the metadata tokens from the page template, each of the metadata tokens indicative of the dynamic content*** (see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system parses the template for placeholders, locates the placeholders and replaces them with dynamic content to generate a web page in response to the user's request);
- ***retrieving, from a metadata repository, metadata components corresponding to the metadata tokens and operable to provide the dynamic content corresponding to the parsed metadata tokens*** (see Figures 5 and 6; see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Pages 5-6, Paragraphs 0048-0055; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system comprises JSPs that include XML containers, wherein the system translates the placeholders into presentations of the containers comprising the obtained dynamic content);
- ***retrieving, based on the metadata components, the display data and the output data from a repository, the display data and output data corresponding to the dynamic content for rendering on the output report*** (see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see

Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system replaces the located placeholders with dynamic content using ILayoutStructure objects and iViews);

- ***processing the metadata components using the retrieved display data and output data to generate the dynamic content corresponding to the parsed metadata tokens*** (see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system replaces the located placeholders with dynamic content using ILayoutStructure objects and iViews); and
- ***inserting the dynamic content in the output report by replacing the metadata tokens*** (see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation, as clearly indicated in the cited text).

Claim 11:

Hefetz discloses *the method of Claim 10, wherein the metadata components further comprise page descriptors, the page descriptors conforming to a declarative syntax and indicative of the dynamic content* (see Figures 5 and 6; see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Pages 5-6, Paragraphs 0048-0055; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in

that the system comprises JSPs that include XML containers, wherein the system translates the placeholders into presentations of the containers comprising the obtained dynamic content).

Claim 14:

Hefetz discloses *the method of Claim 1, wherein the display data further comprises user specific views, the user specific views indicative of formatting and display preferences specific to a particular user and operable for interpretation by syntax processing components to render the display data according to the user specific views* (see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system personalizes the views presented to particular users).

Regarding independent Claim 15:

Claim 15 merely recites a device that performs the methods of Claims 1 and 5-7. Thus, Claim 15 is rejected using the same rationale, as specified in the above rejections for Claims 1 and 5-7.

Claims 16-18, 22-25 and 28:

Claims 16-18, 22-25 and 28 merely recite a device that performs the methods of Claims 2, 1, 4, 8-11 and 14, respectively. Thus, Claims 16-18, 22-25 and 28 are

rejected using the same rationale, as specified in the above rejections for Claims 2, 1, 4, 8-11 and 14.

Regarding independent Claim 30:

Claim 30 merely recites instructions for performing the methods of Claims 1 and 5-7. Thus, Claim 30 is rejected using the same rationale, as indicated in the above rejection for Claims 1 and 5-7.

Claims 12, 13, 26, 27, 29 and 31-37, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Hefetz et al. US 20040123238A1 filed 07/28/2003 [hereinafter “Hefetz”], in view of Ehring et al. US 20050097008A1 Continuation of 09/466,541 - filed 12/17/1999 [hereinafter “Ehring”], in view of Hutsch et al US 20010034771A1 filed 01/12/2001 [hereinafter “Hutsch”].

Claim 12:

As indicated in the above rejection, Hefetz and Ehring disclose every limitation of Claim 1. Specially Hefetz discloses that ***the parsing further comprises identifying a software component operable to process the metadata token, wherein the metadata component is retrieved and processed by the software component*** (see Figures 5 and 6; see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Pages 5-

6, Paragraphs 0048-0055; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → discloses this limitation in that the system translates the placeholders into presentations of the containers comprising the obtained dynamic content).

Hefetz and Ehring fail to expressly teach, but Hutsch teaches:

- ***the metadata token corresponds to a JavaBean component and the java bean component operable to process the metadata token, the method further comprising: retrieving the metadata component by the JavaBean component; and processing the metadata component by the JavaBean component.***

(See Hutsch Page 8 para 127- 128, discloses dynamically generated pages that can be displayed on the user device, e.g., HTML/WML /XML pages, using logic service 323, servlets, and JAVA beans as models, and JAVASERVER PAGES objects as views. JAVA bean forms a connection with universal content broker 113 to retrieve data. A servlet extracts the desired information from the data and inserts the information in a JAVASERVER PAGE object that in turn is used to generate a page that can be returned for display on user device 102i or 102j.

Also, see Hutsch Page 19 Para 267, discloses the decision tree follows the rules of a well-formed XML document. The decision tree includes a hierarchically organized data structure composed of connected nodes.

Using the broadest reasonable interpretation, the Examiner reads the claimed ***metadata, and token*** as equivalent to XML (Metadata), and XML nodes as taught by Hutsch.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method, disclosed in Hefetz, to include:

- *building further comprising rendering an output page, by fetching, based on the parsed token, a page descriptor corresponding to parsed token, retrieving the dynamic content from the fetched page descriptor, the page descriptor defining the metalanguage representation,*

for the purpose of designs content components and application rules that are interpreted by the system dynamically, at runtime, to generate and deliver to users personalized HTML web pages, including client-side objects that track user behavior and enhance users' interaction with the application. Such rules dynamically adapt the author's goals to the appropriate users at the appropriate time, thereby simulating the dialogue between users and human salespersons/customer service personnel in the context of an automated interactive system (see Ehring at Page 1 Para 12).

Claim 13:

Hefetz discloses ***metadata components [that] are XML files including at least one page descriptor according to the predetermined syntax, and processing [that] further comprises retrieving the page descriptors by the software components and producing HTML code corresponding to the page descriptors***

(see Figures 5 and 6; see Page 1, Paragraph 0003; see Pages 2-3, Paragraphs 0023-0026; see Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0033; see Pages 4-5, Paragraph 0042; see Pages 5-6, Paragraphs 0048-0055; see Page 7, Paragraphs 0056-0059 → Hefetz discloses this limitation in that the system comprises JSPs that include XML containers, wherein the system translates the placeholders into presentations of the containers comprising the obtained dynamic content).

Claims 26 and 27:

Claims 26 and 27 merely recite a device that performs the methods of Claims 12 and 13, respectively. Thus, Claims 26 and 27 are rejected using the same rationale, as specified in the above rejections for Claims 12 and 13.

Regarding independent Claim 29:

Claim 29 merely recites computer software for performing the methods of Claim 1, 5, 10 and 12. Thus, Claim 29 is rejected using the same rationale, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 1, 5, 10 and 12.

Regarding independent Claim 31:

Claim 31 merely recites a device for performing the methods of Claims 1, 5-7, 10 and 12. Thus, Claim 31 is rejected using the same rationale, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 1, 5-7, 10 and 12.

Claims 32 and 34:

Claims 32 and 34 merely recite a device for performing the methods of Claims 1, 5-7, 10 and 12. Thus, Claims 32 and 34 are rejected using the same rationale, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 1, 5-7, 10 and 12.

Claims 33 and 35:

Claims 33 and 35 merely recite a device for performing the methods of Claims 12 and 13. Thus, Claims 33 and 35 are rejected using the same rationale, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 12 and 13.

Claim 36:

The subject matter recited in Claim 36 corresponds to the recited limitations of Claims 10 and 12. Thus, Claim 36 is rejected using the same rationale, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 10 and 12.

Claim 37:

The subject matter recited in Claim 37 corresponds to the recited limitations of Claims 12 and 13. Thus, Claim 37 is rejected using the same rationale, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 12 and 13.

It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art.

See, MPEP 2123.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's RCE filed on 07/24/2007 with respect to claims 1-2, 4-16, 18, and 22-37 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. This office action is a Non-Final Rejection in order to give the applicant sufficient opportunity to response to the new line of rejection.

In addition, it is noted, Hefetz discloses a portal-based networked environment that allows client computers to access data over a network through a portal. The portal can receive information from web applications (e.g., web services) to fulfill requests from the client computers. The information can be dynamic content, and the applications can be dynamic content sources. The portal can be integrated with an enterprise management system that consolidates multiple application services. The integrated enterprise management system can provide integrated application services to manage business objects and processes in a business enterprise, thereby consolidating and integrating the data and functionality of multiple different applications

into a single enterprise management tool provided through the portal. See Hefetz – Pages 3-4, Paragraphs 0032-0035.

Hefetz discloses a portal page template that provides run-time translators corresponding to page elements defined in the template. At run-time, the translators are invoked. Upon invoking the translators, one or more content components are obtained for each page element, and the corresponding page element is translated into a presentation of the obtained one or more content elements. See Hefetz – Pages 4-5, Paragraphs 0040-0044.

Hefetz discloses that the content presented via the portal includes JSPs. See Hefetz – Page 1, Paragraph 0003 and Pages 2-3, Paragraph 0024. Thus, Hefetz discloses obtaining JSPs as dynamic content for inclusion into the web page/web application that is presented to the user and obtaining one or more content components for each page element on the web page. The examiner interprets this disclosure to include obtaining nested JSPs for inclusion into the web page/web application as dynamic content. Also, as indicated in Copeland, et al., US 6,877,025, web pages/web applications having dynamic content comprising nested JSPs were well known to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made (see Copeland – Column 4, Lines 10-30).

To address the newly amended portions, the Examiner introduces the **Ehring** and **Hutsch** references as discuss in the 103(a) rejections cites above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quoc A. Tran whose telephone number is 571-272-8664. The examiner can normally be reached on 9AM - 5PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on 571-272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Quoc A. Tran
Art Unit 2176
08/24/2007

Doug Hutton
Supervisory Primary Examiner
Technology Center 2100